

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4 - 12, and 14-17 are pending and under consideration.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-12, 14, 16 and 17 were rejected.

Claims 5 and 15 were objected to as being dependent on rejected base claims.

With this Amendment, Claims 1 and 11 have been amended and Claims 4, 5, 14, and 15 have been cancelled. No new matter has been introduced as a result of this amendment.

Accordingly, Claims 1, 2, 6-12, and 16-17 are at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9-12, and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tsang et al. ("Tsang") (U.S. Patent No. 6,047,000).

Further, Claims 5 and 15 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any interviewing claims.

Independent Claims 1 and 11 have been amended by incorporating the limitations of Claims 4 and 5, and 14 and 15, respectively. Thus, the rejections of Claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) are now moot.

Accordingly, Claims 1 and 11 are allowable over Tsang, and corresponding dependent Claims 2, 6 10, and 12, 16-17 are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6- 8, 10-12, 14 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Goren et al. ("Goren") (U.S. Patent No. 6,882,623).

As stated above, Claims 5 and 15 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any interviewing claims.

Independent Claims 1 and 11 have been amended by incorporating the limitations of Claims 4 and 5, and 14 and 15, respectively. Thus, the rejections of Claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) are now moot.

Accordingly, Claims 1 and 11 are allowable over Goren, and corresponding dependent Claims 2, 6-8, and 10-12, and 16-17 are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that Claims 1, 2, 6-12, and 16-17 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 8, 2006

By: _____

David R. Metzger

Registration No. 32,919

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

P.O. Box 061080

Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080

(312) 876-8000